DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 291 SP 014 259

AUTHOR Greene, Myrna; Dravland, Vern
TITLE Relationships Between Success in an Education Program and Success in the Teaching Profession.
SPONS AGENCY Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies, Edmonton.; Lethbridge Univ. (Alberta).
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Effective Teaching; Evaluation Criteria; *Factor Analysis; Predictor Variables; *Program Evaluation; Schools of Education; Statistical Studies; *Success Factors; Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This study examined the teaching effectiveness of a random sample of the University of Lethbridge Bachelor of Education graduates and related various components of their success to the performance of those same individuals as students within the teacher education program. Results are discussed in four major sections: (1) a description of the sample; (2) factors influencing success as perceived by principals and by teachers; (3) analyses of the evaluations of success as assessed by the professor in student teaching, the teacher self-evaluation, and the principal's evaluation; and (4) comparison of professors' assessments of future teaching success and principals' evaluations of teaching performance. Results showed what appeared to be a definite relationship between success in the program and success in teaching, but individual components of the program were not good predictors of success in teaching. References and examples of the questionnaires used in the study are included. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170291

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SUCCESS IN AN EDUCATION PROGRAM AND SUCCESS IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Myrna Greene
Vern Dravland

Faculty of Education
The University of Lethbridge

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Myrna L. Greene

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, April 8-12, 1979

SP011359

ABSTRACT

In the final analysis, a teacher education program must be evaluated in terms of the success of its graduates. This study examined the teaching effectiveness of a random sample of The University of Lethbridge Bachelor of Education graduates and related various components of their success to the performance of those same individuals as students within the teacher education program. There appeared to be a definite relationship between success in the program and success in teaching, but individual components of the program were not good predictors of success in teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the cooperation of the Alberta school superintendents, principals and teachers who so willingly participated in this study. Also very much appreciated was the cooperation and financial support of The University of Lethbridge Faculty of Education, and the cooperation of Dr. J. Reid of the Student Evaluation and Data Processing Division of The Alberta Department of Education.

The financial assistance provided by The University of Lethbridge Research Fund and The Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	2
METHODOLOGY	7
LIMITATIONS	8
RESULTS	11
DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE	11
FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHING SUCCESS	13
ANALYSIS OF SUCCESS AS DETERMINED BY PROFESSORS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS	17
OVERALL ASSESSMENTS	17
RATINGS ON INDIVIDUAL CATEGORIES OF THE EVALUATION FORM.	18
MULTIPLE REGRESSION	18
FACTOR ANALYSIS	23
PREDICTIONS OF SUCCESS AND PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS	26
DISCUSSION	29
RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER STUDY	32
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX A	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency of Ratings Assigned to Teachers	12
2.	Factors Thought to Contribute The Most to Teaching Success and Teaching Failure	14
3.	Frequency of Factors Identified As Being The "Single Most Important Factor In Determining Teaching Success (Or Teaching Failure)"	15
4.	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Professor Evaluations	20
5.	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Principal Evaluations	21
6.	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Teacher Self Evaluations	22
7.	Professors' Evaluations of the Student Teachers: Varimax Rotation Following The Extraction of Six Factors By Common Factor Analysis	24
8.	Principals' Evaluations of the Practising Teachers: Varimax Rotation Following The Extraction of Six Factors By Common Factor Analysis	25

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of teacher education concerns ensuring that graduates who have attained a requisite degree of success in a teacher education program, are in fact capable and effective teachers. "Making relevant judgements about probable teacher success during [teacher] preparation requires demonstrating that a criterion employed during the preparatory program is a correlate of a later criterion intrinsic to work success" (Turner, 1974, p.87). The practical implications of this requirement necessitate demonstrating that criterion characteristics, skills and techniques contribute to teacher effectiveness before they can be justified as being of merit within an educational program.

Very few teacher education programs are conducting longitudinal studies to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their graduates and to identify components of the program which might have contributed to that success or lack of success. This study, which is a part of a much larger project known as QAULTEP[1], was designed to identify successful and unsuccessful teaching graduates of the University of Lethbridge B.Ed. program and to determine relationships between their teaching success and their success within the teacher education program. It was the first study within QAULTEP to collect teaching data on graduates of the program and therefore was conducted partially to examine and evaluate the research design and methodology, to identify limitations and weaknesses in the study, and to make recommendations for a major follow-up project presently in the early planning stages.

[1]QAULTEP is an acronym for the Qualitative Analysis of the University of of Lethbridge Teacher Education Program.

Purpose and Objectives

The major purpose of the study was to develop a collection of variables which appear to be the most valid and reliable for evaluating a teacher education program. Specific objectives were to:

1) identify factors perceived to influence teaching success or teachers' perceptions of success,
2) determine components of teaching success as identified by teachers and their principals,
3) determine the relationship between evaluations of performance in an education program and evaluations of performance as a practising teacher, and
4) determine the validity of the professors' assessments of future teaching success in terms of the principals' evaluations of teaching performance.

Review of the Literature

"The validity of a teacher education program is determined ultimately by the production of teachers who perform more effectively in classrooms than had they not received such training" (Austin, 1974, p.13). Unfortunately there are very few studies in the field which have been able to prove that teacher training does make a difference. Beery (1962), in a study comparing provisionally certified beginning teachers with those who had completed the prescribed education program, concluded that the fully certified teachers were "consistently and significantly rated by competent observers to be more effective" (p.395). However, there have been very few studies of this type. In fact, Bausell and Moody (1973) maintained that "teacher preparation as provided by colleges of education does not result in student achievement" (p.208). Turner (1973) disagreed, citing

several defects in the studies on which Bausell and Moody based their conclusions. He asserted further that neither they nor Popham (whom they cited) had produced studies from which dependable information about teacher education could be extracted. Part of the problem, of course, is that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a control group; that is, a group of "teachers" who have not had teacher preparation.

A second, and perhaps more important problem, is that of defining teaching effectiveness. Sandefur and Adams (1976) stated that "teacher education institutions fail to effectively evaluate graduates primarily because of the profession's inability to determine what constitutes effective teaching, and partly from a lack of evaluation tools and techniques" (p.71). They did go on to describe their model for the evaluation of teaching, which was based on the assumption that both of those obstacles had been partially removed.

Doyle (1975) indicated that in spite of a flurry of research activity, most studies have "failed to support the existence of stable and consistent relationships between teacher variables and effectiveness criteria" (p.2). He reiterated this theme in 1978. However, Gage (1978) believes that these conclusions can be questioned on several grounds. He agrees with Glass (1976) that studies with flaws in the design or analysis may still be valid. He states further that "...the true relationship, if any, between any single dimension of teacher behaviour and pupil achievement or attitude is probably low [and that] the teaching-learning process is so complex that any single significant variable in teacher behaviour should have only a low correlation...with student achievement" (p.230). According to Gage, with the small sample sizes typical of most teacher studies, it is unreasonable to expect results to be significant at the .05 or .01 levels.

Gage's optimism should be encouraging to researchers who continue to believe that the teacher effectiveness question can ultimately be answered. Doyle (1975) suggests that "the persistence of the belief in the answerability of the question, in the face of discouraging results, would seem to be linked to the persistence of the personnel selection and evaluation problem faced by school administrators... . If one is charged with the responsibility of finding and keeping 'good' teachers, he is forced to accept the premise that 'good' teachers are identifiable" (pp.15, 16).

Although it may not be easy or even possible at this time to define effective teaching, teachers are in fact being hired and evaluated and recommended or not recommended for certification. It appears that the person most directly responsible for evaluating the teacher is the principal and/or superintendent. When teachers are selected for positions, their prospective employers assume that because they have successfully completed a teacher education program, they will be "acceptable teachers". To follow that premise to its logical next step, the employer should be able to expect that those who obtained the greatest success in the education program, should become the most successful teachers. There has been little evidence to show that this is in fact the case. Hall (1964) stated that "very little research evidence is available to verify or deny that teacher education institutions are doing an effective job in preparing future teachers" (p.72). Using pupil growth on standardized achievement tests as a measure of effective teaching, he found it to be of questionable value as the sole criterion but he did conclude that average pupil gains were higher for pupils taught by certified teachers.

Turner (1975) identified two studies (Ducharme, 1970, and Greaves, 1972) which led him to conclude that "ratings of student teaching performance consistently correlate with principals' ratings of success in

teaching" (p.103). Labriola (1965) concluded from a follow-up study of 200 teachers that it is possible to predict success in the initial teaching experience based on the teacher's performance in student teaching. However, Pratt (1977), after a review of several such studies, stated that "...generally low agreement has been found between in-training assessments based on practice teaching and subsequent ratings by supervisors" (p.12).

Criteria other than performance in student teaching have also been used to attempt to predict teaching effectiveness. Vittetoe (1977) identified 144 superior and 100 inferior first year teachers, based on principal ratings. He found that one-fourth of the superior teachers had had low GPA's in the education program and several of the failures had had high GPA's. He did find some relationship between teaching success, subject area, and similarity to the student teaching experience. Ryans (1960) in a comprehensive research study of characteristics of teachers, concluded that academically outstanding students did score significantly higher than other groups on many attributes considered to be characteristic of good teachers.

Ort (1964) conducted a study of various techniques used to predict the success of teachers. Supervisors were asked to rate the teachers on the same evaluation form as the one used during the teachers' student teaching experience. Various personality and attitude tests such as the MTAI and the MMPI were also used as predictors. He concluded among other things that:

1) "academic achievement in college does not seem to have any predictive value as to how successful a student will be as a student teacher or as a teacher in his first year of experience", 2) "the results from personality and teacher attitude inventories...did not have any predictive

value", and 3) "the best predictions of the future success of a student teacher, even though limited, can be made by the supervising teacher and the campus supervisors" (p.70).

Anderson and Hunka (1963) stated that "conventional research into the evaluation and prediction of teaching proficiency and criterion variables has reached a dead end because negligible relationships exist within and among the various criteria of teaching proficiency, the ultimate criterion of pupil growth along desired dimensions, the immediate criterion of practice teaching marks, and the intermediate criterion of principals' or superintendents' ratings" (p.74).

The use of principals' or superintendents' assessments as a measure of success in teaching has come under considerable attack. Hain and Smith (1968) found that principals used criteria such as bus duty, playground and cafeteria duty, and observation while the teacher moved from one class to another, more often than formal observation or classroom visits. Turner (1975) suggests that work success can be reduced to three classes of criterion variables: student attainment, professional judgement and student judgement. Sandefur and Adams (1976) utilize four categories of evaluative data: career line data, direct classroom observation, pupil, peer and supervisory evaluations, and standardized measures. Ryans (1960), however, stated categorically that "only time sampling involving replicated systematic observation by trained observers produces sufficiently reliable results to recommend its use in fundamental research" (p.374). He does allow that other data would be acceptable for broader discrimination.

In spite of the weaknesses in the utilization of principal and self evaluations, it was decided to use these assessments as the initial measures of teaching success for this study. Principals are in fact evaluating teachers, and they do have considerable impact into the teacher

education program. This was the initial attempt at evaluating teaching graduates and the opinions and cooperation of the principals were considered to be crucial for this study and for the follow-up study which is expected to utilize a more sophisticated evaluation system.

Methodology

This study was one of many studies within the framework of QAULTEP.[2] QAULTEP is a longitudinal project which has as its ultimate goal the development of a model for the evaluation of teacher education programs. The data bank now contains approximately 400 variables on each of 600 students in three populations, created for the purposes of replication and validation. The variables include biographical information, pre-education data, (for example, scores on several psychological, personality and English tests, and grades in the students' first two years of arts and science courses), evaluations in the three education practica, and much other education data. Many QAULTEP studies have examined relationships within and among the pre-education, selection and training categories of variables. However, this was the first QAULTEP study to examine the teaching success of graduates of the program and to relate their teaching effectiveness to their performance within the education program.

The sample for this study consisted of a random selection of 50 University of Lethbridge graduates who were in the second population of the QAULTEP study, who had completed their teacher preparation at The University of Lethbridge and had been awarded a B.Ed. degree, and who

[2]For more information on QAULTEP, see Dravland, V., and Greene, M. "Development of a Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs". Paper to be presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979.

were teaching in a public school system in Alberta. Detailed questionnaires were mailed to each graduate and, with his/her permission, to the principal (see Appendix A). The questions related to placement and other factors thought to influence a teacher's success, and opinions about what constitutes teaching effectiveness. One section of the questionnaire was identical to the instrument that had been used for the evaluation of the individual as a student teacher in the teacher education program. The principal was asked to evaluate the practising teacher using this same form; that is, using the same 39 competencies on the 1 to 5 rating scale. Each teacher independently completed a self-evaluation using the same criteria.

Forty-six pairs of questionnaires and one individual principal questionnaire were returned for a response rate of 93%. In addition, a personal structured interview was conducted with 89% of the respondents. Much of the data collected from the interviews pertained to specifics of The University of Lethbridge teacher education program; these results are not included in this report.

Descriptive analysis appeared to be most appropriate for much of the data. As well, the Chi-square test, multiple regression techniques, and factor analyses were utilized to obtain the greatest possible meaning from the considerable amount of available data.

Limitations

No attempt was made to define teaching effectiveness or teaching success. The assumption was made that principals can and do differentiate between good and poor teachers and that teachers themselves have perceptions of their own success. Therefore, principals' evaluations and self-evaluations were used as the measures of teaching success. The evaluation instrument listed 39 competencies and/or characteristics in four categories:

preparation, performance, personal attributes and professional attributes. From the ratings on these 39 variables, principals were asked to assign the teachers a number from 1 to 5 for "overall assessment of teaching success" (this corresponded to the category "global assessment of performance" on the student teaching evaluation form). Also, principals were asked to rank the teacher's success on a scale from 1 to 10 "relative to other teachers at the school". It was hoped that this qualifying phrase would make the ratings more comparable. However, it appeared to compound the problem as some principals ignored the statement and rated the teacher relative to all other teachers they had known or relative to their concept of the "ideal" teacher. Some principals stated that all their teachers were excellent that year. Therefore, two equally "good" teachers could have received very different ratings depending on the staffs to which they were compared.

A second major limitation in terms of data analysis was a result of University of Lethbridge policies. The University of Lethbridge students spend two pre-education years in Arts and Science before entering the Faculty of Education. There are always some students who drop out during those first two years. In addition, all potential education students must take an Orientation to Teaching course in the first two years of arts and science courses. Approximately 30 to 35% of those who take that initial education course do not enter the Faculty of Education. According to an informal poll of Arts and Science faculty members, those who do enter the Faculty of Education are among the better students in their first two years at the university. Also, a certain number of students who do enter the Faculty of Education do not complete degree requirements. In order to graduate, students must receive at least a "C" in student teaching, and

a minimum GPA (grade point average) of 2.00 on a four point scale. Therefore, the sample was selected from a homogeneous group of highly qualified people. One would not expect to find significant correlations among such a group.

A third limitation concerned the size of the sample. With small sample sizes and a large number of variables, the findings must be interpreted with caution. Factor analyses especially may be misleading with a large number of variables and a small sample size. The small sample size also made a full descriptive analysis difficult; in order to protect the anonymity of the respondents, some of the discussion had to be kept relatively general.

The exploratory nature of the study must be kept in mind throughout this report. There was a very considerable amount of data and a well-designed follow-up study is necessary to clarify some of the results and to be confident of the analyses.

RESULTS

The findings of this study are discussed in four major sections:

1. a description of the sample,
2. factors influencing success as perceived by principals and by teachers,
3. analyses of the evaluations of success as assessed by the professor in student teaching, the teacher self-evaluation, and the principal's evaluation, and
4. comparison of professors' assessments of future teaching success and principals' evaluations of teaching performance.

Description of the Sample

Forty-seven principals and 46 teachers returned their completed questionnaires. For comparison purposes, the sample was limited to the 46 teachers for whom there was a principal evaluation and a professor evaluation of student teaching; 27 were female and 19 were male. All of the teachers had done their student teaching at The University of Lethbridge between 1974 and 1976; five (11%) were in their first year of teaching and the remainder in their second year. They were teaching in various subject areas and at various grade levels from kindergarten to Grade 12. Most (83%) were teaching in public school systems, seven (15%) were in separate systems and one did not specify. School size ranged from 50 to 1,540 students ($\underline{M}$=382) and town size varied from less than 500 people to more than 500,000; 70% of the schools were in communities with fewer than 5,000 people. All of the teachers were under 30 years of age, except possibly for six who did not answer the question.

All the principals in the sample were male; 54% were over 40 years of age, 41% were between 30 and 40 years, and only two were under 30. Eleven (24%) had been principals or vice-principals for 15 or more years, 19 (41%) for 5 to 14 years, and the rest (35%) for fewer than five years.

On the whole, the principals appeared to be very pleased with The University of Lethbridge graduates. The principals were asked to rate the teachers on a scale from 1 to 10 relative to other teachers at the school. Only four teachers were rated less than 5 ($\underline{M}$=6.75). When rating themselves on the same scale, teachers as a whole were slightly more generous ($\underline{M}$=7.05), but also a little more reluctant to assign themselves to the extreme ends of the scale (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Frequency of Ratings Assigned to Teachers

Rating*	By Principals	By Self
1	0	0
2	1	0
3	0	1
4	3	2
5	7	4
6	6	5
7	7	12
8	11	15
9	2	5
10	3	0
No response	6	2
Total	46	46
$\underline{M}$	6.75	7.05
$\underline{SD}$	.182	1.45

*Rating on a 1 to 10 scale relative to other teachers at the school.

Factors Influencing Teaching Success

Principals and teachers were asked to indicate the relative importance of each of eleven factors in determining teaching success and teaching failure (see Table 2). There appeared to be little difference between teachers' and principals' opinions or between factors thought to contribute the most to teaching success and those thought to be most important in determining teaching failure. In both cases, teachers and principals ranked classroom control, communication skills and preparation as the three most important factors.

However, when teachers and principals were asked in a personal interview to identify the "single most important factor in determining teaching success", without the interviewer specifying any factors from which to choose, the list that emerged was slightly different (see Table 3). Teachers most often mentioned factors relating to relationships with children (empathy, rapport, love, etc.) while principals tended to mention classroom management skills and personal attitudes more often. The same question was asked with regard to teaching failure. Again, no attempt was made to define teaching failure. In many cases, the response was "the opposite of the previous answer". But many respondents interpreted the question as measuring very different qualities (also see Table 3). Classroom control appeared to teachers to be far more related to teaching failure than to teaching success. It is interesting to note that only three persons in either group identified "having an effect on student learning" as the most important factor in teaching success or failure.

When asked in the interviews, "If you could replace 75% of your present teaching staff with whomever you chose, would you retain this teacher?", principals gave the following responses:

TABLE 2

Factors Thought To Contribute The Most To Teaching Success And Teaching Failure

	By Principals		By Teachers	
	Weighted M	Rank	Weighted M	Rank
Factors	**Teaching Success**			
Classroom Control	4.80	1	4.87	1
Communication Skills	4.74	2	4.61	2
Preparation	4.65	3	4.54	3
Personality	4.44	4	4.35	5.5
Knowledge of Subject	4.30	5	4.41	4
Teaching Methods	4.22	6	4.35	5.5
Placement Suitability	3.72	7	4.17	7
School Administration	3.56	8	4.09	8
Staff Interpersonal Relations	3.54	9	3.98	9
Teaching Experience	3.33	10	3.74	10.5
Student Characteristics	3.23	11	3.74	10.5
	Teaching Failure			
Classroom Control	4.87	1	4.76	1
Preparation	4.65	2	4.27	3
Communication Skills	4.45	3	4.41	2
Personality	4.24	4	3.94	4.5
Teaching Methods	4.04	5	3.84	6
Knowledge of Subject	3.82	6	3.94	4.5
School Administration	3.54	7	3.46	9
Placement suitability	3.47	8	3.83	7
Staff Interpersonal Relations	3.17	9	3.02	11
Teaching Experience	2.96	10.5	3.16	10
Student Characteristics	2.96	10.5	3.54	8

TABLE 3

Frequency of Factors Identified As Being The "Single Most Important Factor in Determining Teaching Success (Or Teaching Failure)"

Factors Identified	Most Important In Teaching Success		Most Important In Teaching Failure	
	By		By	
	Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers
Relationships with children (love, rapport, empathy, caring)*	8	15	6	14
Personal attitudes and relationships	9	6	5	4
Classroom management	9	4	14	10
Preparation, planning	0	5	3	2
Self-confidence, poise	3	4	2	3
Dedication, sincerity, ambition	3	2	4	3
Adaptability	0	2	0	2
Effecting student learning	1	2	0	0
Class size	0	1	0	0
Knowledge of subject	1	0	0	0
Difficult children	0	0	1	2
False idealism	0	0	0	1
No response	2	0	1	0
	36	41	36	41

*For teaching failure, the factor mentioned would be "a lack of" a particular characteristic such as classroom control, or the opposite of the trait mentioned; e.g., "insincerity" rather than "sincerity".

Yes	-	28	68.3%
Maybe	-	6	14.6%
No	-	7	17.1%
		41	100%

Many of the principals indicated that their responses might have been different another year. It must also be remembered that the principals were comparing these first and second year teachers to other teachers who may have had many years of experience. Those who had answered "no", gave the following reasons:

1. lacking in dedication and ability,
2. personality,
3. lack of experience,
4. too many fantastic teachers this year.

It was hypothesized that teaching success would be related to job satisfaction, and that factors such as teaching load, salary, community and social activities, and subject and grade level placement would affect the teacher's feeling of satisfaction. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of this study.

It was first determined that principals' and teachers' perceptions of these factors were very similar. Principals and teachers rated the "teaching convenience" of the school in a similar manner; both rated similarly the community social activities and the teachers' participation in the social activities. There were slight differences in the assessments of the teachers' teaching load and extracurricular activities. However, most of the principals (82%) and about two-thirds of the teachers themselves rated their teaching loads comparable to that of other teachers; 16% of the principals rated the teacher's assignment heavier than average

as did 29% of the teachers.

The principals' ratings and overall assessments, and the teachers' self-ratings and overall assessments were then crosstabulated with size of school, community size, participation in social activities, teaching load, teacher satisfaction with salary, time spent in extra-curricular activities, number of teachers in the school, and subject and grade level placement. None of the relationsips were statistically significant; nor were any particular trends evident in the analysis. There did appear to be some relationship between the teacher's feelings of satisfaction with his/her particular teaching assignment and the principal's overall assessment of success ($p=.05$) and his rating on the 1 to 10 scale ($p=.06$). Of those rated above average, 94% were satisfied; of those rated below average, only one-fourth were happy with their assignments. Only three teachers indicated that they were very unhappy with their teaching assignments. All three were below average on the principals' overall assessment of success.

Analysis of Success as Determined by Professors, Principals and Teachers

Overall Assessments. For each of the three evaluators there were two overall measures of success: for professors, the "global assessment" category on the student teaching evaluation form and the grade in student teaching; for principals and teacher self-evaluations, the "overall assessment of teaching success" category on the evaluation form and the rating on the 1 to 10 scale. As one would expect, the relationship between each of the two measures for each of the three evaluators was significant ($p<.01$).

There was no apparent relationship between the principals' ratings of teaching success and the teachers' self ratings; only for 18 (47%) of

the 38 teachers who had both principal and self ratings, were the ratings similar. Ten (26%) of the teachers rated themselves higher than did their principals; the same number rated themselves lower. The grade received in the student teaching practicum did not appear to be related to either principal ratings or to teacher self ratings.

Similarly, no statistically significant relationship existed among overall assessments by professors, teachers, or principals. The principal's response to the question of whether he would keep the teacher given the opportunity to replace 75% of his staff was not related to grade in student teaching or to professors' assessments. Nor was it related to teacher self assessments. It was, of course, significantly related to the principals' assessments ($p=.000$) and ratings ($p=.002$).

Ratings on Individual Categories of the Evaluation Form. None of the correlations between principal and professor ratings on the 39 variables on the evaluation form were statistically significant. However, with the large number of variables (39), the small number of subjects (46), and the small range of scores (2 to 5), it was not surprising that the correlations were not significant. It seemed logical to assume that different evaluators might be concentrating on different aspects of teaching in order to arrive at their overall estimates of success. Therefore the 39 variables on each of the three evaluation forms were subjected to multiple regression techniques and to factor analyses procedures in an attempt to account for differences among evaluators.

Multiple Regression. For each of the three evaluation forms, the "overall assessment of success" variables was used as the criterion; each regression was also re-run using the 1 to 10 rating of success as the criterion for teachers and principals, and grade in student teaching as the

criterion for professors. In all cases, for a variable to enter the regression the F value for the next step had to be significant at the .05 level (Guilford and Fruchter, 1975, p.368).

For the professor evaluations with global assessment as the dependent variable, four variables met the criteria, and together accounted for 79% of the variance (see Table 4). With grade in student teaching as the dependent variable, eight variables entered the regression and produced a multiple correlation of .974 with a standard error of .185. These results must be interpreted with caution since the sample size was small and it was therefore possible to account for a large portion of the variance. It is interesting to note, though, that in both cases, professors appeared to concentrate on variables related to the student teachers' preparation and interaction with pupils.

For the principal evaluations, with "overall assessment" as the dependent variable, one variable (suitability of lesson materials and media) by itself accounted for 89% of the variance, and only one other entered the regression (see Table 5). These variables were ones which conceivably could have been rated by the principal without his every having observed the teacher teaching. With the 1 to 10 rating as the criterion variable, four variables entered the regression and produced a multiple R of .969 with a standard error of .524. Here classroom management and "self-image" characteristics were paramount.

The teachers themselves appeared to place more emphasis on appearance and classroom control and management techniques (see Table 6), but it should be noted that the portion of variance accounted for was smaller and the standard error was greater than for professors' or principals' evaluations.

TABLE 4

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Professor Evaluations [a]

Dependent Variable = Professors' Global Assessments of Success		
Variable Entering	Step	Multiple R
Motivation of pupils	(1)	.731
Consistency of preparation	(2)	.824
Respect & admiration from pupils	(3)	.862
Presenting information	(4)	.895
Standard error = 0.323		

Dependent Variable = Grade In Student Teaching		
Consistency of preparation	(1)	.784
Respect & admiration from pupils	(2)	.886
Presenting information	(3)	.925
Enthusiasm & vitality	(4)	.948
Handling routines	(5)	.956
Voice quality	(6)	.964
Initiative	(7)	.971
Adaptability	(8)	.975
Standard error = .185		

a) N=37

TABLE 5

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Principal Evaluations [a]

Variable Entering	Step	Multiple R
Dependent Variable = Principal's Assessments of Teaching Success		
Suitability of lesson materials and media	(1)	.944
Justifiable self-confidence	(2)	.960
Standard error = .248		
Dependent Variable = Principals' Ratings		
Classroom management	(1)	.897
Self-concept	(2)	.941
Self-evaluation	(3)	.957
Leading discussion	(4)	.970
Standard error = .524		

a) N=24

TABLE 6

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on Teacher Self Evaluations [a]

Dependent Variable = Self Assessments of Teaching Success		
Variable Entering	Step	Multiple R
Personal appearance	(1)	.412
Classroom control	(2)	.631
Planning ability	(3)	.695
Creativity	(4)	.800
Maturity and judgement	(5)	.848
Handling routines	(6)	.879
Standard error = .787		
Dependent Variable = Self Ratings		
Classroom management	(1)	.590
Initiative	(2)	.740
Standard error = .933		

a) N=28

Factor Analysis. Factor analysis using an orthogonal solution was conducted on the 39 variables in each of the professors' and principals' evaluations. A listwise deletion procedure was utilized; that is, cases were excluded from the analysis if there was missing data on any one of the 39 variables. This reduced the sample size considerably and interpretations from the analysis may be very misleading.

The factor analysis procedure was repeated several times, first allowing the program to select the number of factors (9 were extracted), and then specifying the number of factors from 2 to 7. The most meaningful interpretation of the analysis appeared to be for four factors for each of the professors and principals. Tables 7 and 8 present the output from that analysis. Loadings are indicated whenever they were the highest for that variable or were .6 and above, or had very little difference between them. All loadings presented were significant beyond the .01 level based on the formula $p<.01 = \pm 2.58SE$ where $SE = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. It had been hypothesized that certain variables should have been grouped together as indicated by the brackets in Tables 7 and 8. This hypothesis was based on the theory underlying the faculty's development of the evaluation form. For professors this hypothesis did not appear to have been supported; for example, the fourth factor seems to be a conglomerate of various qualities. Certain of the other characteristics, especially in Factors 1 and 2, do logically go together, for example, the first four planning-type activities in Factor 2 and the last five characteristics in Factor 1. However, it would be difficult and inappropriate to attempt to name these factors for such a small sample.

TABLE 7

Professors' Evaluations Of The Student Teachers:
Varimax Rotation Following The Extraction Of Six Factors By Common-Factor Analysis [a]

Variable Name	Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3	4
Academic background		.602		
Planning ability		.710		
Suitability of lesson materials & media		.491		
Consistency of preparation		.708		
Effectiveness of methods	.556			
Motivation of pupils	.689			
Leading discussion		.616		
Skill in questioning		.699		
Handling pupil responses	.429	.407		.436
Presenting information	.479			.465
Working with individuals & small groups	.473			
Variety in approach to presentation			.592	
Pacing of lesson		.705		
Creativity (originality)		.527		
Adaptability	.616			
Closure (culminating, summarizing, concluding activities)		.524		
Skill in evaluating pupil learning			.696	
Attention to individual differences			.532	
Classroom management			.647	
Classroom control				.603
Handling routines			.598	
Giving directions		.569		.557
Suitability of physical arrangement of classroom			.576	
Personal appearance		.672		
Classroom manner (poise, self-control)	.477			.463
Enthusiasm & vitality	.540			
Empathy for pupils	.738			
Sense of humor	.604			
Voice quality				.821
English usage		.680		
Self-concept	.600			
Initiative			.585	
Dependability & punctuality		.633		
Maturity & judgement		.550		
Justifiable self-confidence	.558			.534
Self-evaluation	.641			
Response to criticism (receives & implements suggestions)	.793			
Respect & admiration from pupils	.559			
Interpersonal relations with school personnel	.552			

a) N = 38

TABLE 8

Principals' Evaluations Of The Practising Teachers:
Varimax Rotation Following The Extraction Of Six Factors By Common-Factor Analysis [a]

Variable Name	Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3	4
Academic background			.564	
Planning ability			.564	
Suitability of lesson materials & media	.589			
Consistency of preparation	.565			
Effectiveness of methods	.715			
Motivation of pupils	.762			
Leading discussion		.492	.496	
Skill in questioning		.578	.581	
Handling pupil responses		.713		
Presenting information		.754		
Working with individuals & small groups			.885	
Variety in approach to presentation	.683			
Pacing of lesson	.619			
Creativity (originality)	.820			
Adaptability	.601			
Closure (culminating, summarizing, concluding activities)			.625	
Skill in evaluating pupil learning	.444	.458		
Attention to individual differences			.579	
Classroom management				.662
Classroom control				.675
Handling routines				.647
Giving directions		.608		
Suitability of physical arrangement of classroom	.644			
Personal appearance				.714
Classroom manner (poise, self-control)	.717			
Enthusiasm & vitality	.689			
Empathy for pupils	.749			
Sense of humor	.840			
Voice quality	.709			
English usage	.652			
Self-concept		.627		
Initiative		.603		
Dependability & punctuality		.815		
Maturity & judgement		.647		
Justifiable self-confidence		.733		
Self-evaluation		.777		
Response to criticism (receives & implements suggestions)		.685		
Respect & admiration from pupils		.675		
Interpersonal relations with school personnel		.819		

a) N = 31

Principals' factors were a little easier to define; classroom control techniques were clearly identified in Factor 4 and professional characteristics appeared in Factor 2. However, included with the professional characteristics in Factor 2 were variables dealing specifically with teaching techniques. Factor 1 consisted mostly of personal characteristics and qualities that might be assessed outside the classroom. It was interesting to note that no matter how many factors were extracted, for principals the classroom control variables were always together as were the professional characteristics. For professors, planning-preparation variables were always in the same factor.

Predictions of Success and Principals' Evaluation

The statistical analyses of the professors', principals' and teachers' evaluations produced little in terms of statistically significant findings. This was not surprising in the light of Gage's comments discussed previously. In a study of this type a descriptive analysis is often more productive. Accordingly the evaluations were examined in some detail. There was an almost perfect relationship between the grade in student teaching and the professor's prediction of teaching success; that is, a "C" in student teaching corresponded to a prediction of average success in teaching, a "B" corresponded to a prediction of better than average success and an "A" to a prediction of outstanding success.

One would hypothesize then that those who had received high grades and predictions in student teaching would also receive high ratings from the principals. However, although a "C" is usually considered to be an average grade, students in The University of Lethbridge Faculty of Education must have at least a "C" standing to graduate from the program; this requirement

has had effect of raising the actual average to a "B". Therefore, it was predicted that students who had received an "A" in student teaching would also have received an assessment of 4 or 5 and a rating of at least 7 or better from the principal. This prediction was supported for seven out of the eleven students who had received an "A" in student teaching. (One student had not received a rating from the principal.) One would also expect "B" students to have received a rating somewhere between 5 and 8. Again, all but three of the eight "B" students who had principal ratings supported the prediction. Similarly "C" students could be expected to have received ratings of 6 or less. This was the area in which the greatest discrepancy was found; six of the eleven "C" students received ratings higher than a 6 and three received a 6.

Certain trends were apparent for those teachers who did not "fit" the expectations. Of the three students rated highly (A) by the professors but low (<7) by the principals, one was actually assessed very highly in the interview and the principal indicated that he would definitely keep the teacher on staff. The low rating occurred because of the large numbers of "well above average" teachers at the school. Another of the "A" student teachers had left teaching and indicated disillusion with the system. The other had had, according to the supervisors, a detrimental experience in another school, which added to the problems of disorganization and classroom control.

Of the three "B" teachers who did not "fit", one was assessed higher by the principal and two lower. Both of those assessed lower were in large city schools where the supervisor was rating relative to a larger number of teachers and presumably where the choice was greater. The teacher rated

higher was in a small school in a rural area. This does not imply that teachers in larger schools were assessed lower than the others; several of the highly rated teachers were in large urban schools.

All seven of the "C" teachers rated highly by their principals were in rural areas. Most of their professors had indicated that with additional experience they could become very effective teachers. Many had also indicated a need to develop greater confidence. Presumably these teachers had developed this confidence with this additional experience in the rural setting.

DISCUSSION

The major purpose of this study was to develop a collection of variables which are valid and reliable for evaluating a teacher education program. A secondary purpose was to evaluate the design and methodology of the study with a view to conducting a similar, but more extensive follow-up study of University of Lethbridge teaching graduates. In light of the findings of this study, it appears to be premature to present a list of variables useful for evaluating a teacher education program. It must be remembered that this was an exploratory study and to expect to have completely achieved that primary purpose from a preliminary study of only 46 teachers was unrealistic. However, the design of the study and the techniques utilized appear to have been appropriate and with some modifications, should be applicable in the proposed future study.

In spite of the exploratory nature of the study and its limitations, there were several findings worthy of note.

1. Generally, principals were pleased with The University of Lethbridge teacher education program and the first and second year teaching graduates of the program. This was evident in their assessments of the teachers' success (only four were rated at less than a "5" on the 1 to 10 scale relative to other teachers, many of whom had had several years of experience), their responses to the question of whether or not they would keep the teacher given the option to replace 75% of their staff, and from their comments during the interviews.
2. Relationships among grades in student teaching, principals' assessments and ratings of teaching success, teachers' self assessments and ratings, were not statistically significant. Nor were correlations between professor and principal ratings

on any of the 39 variables on the evaluation form significant at the .05 level. However, these findings were not unexpected given the large number of variables, the small sample size, and the complexity of "teaching success".

3. There did appear to be a definite link between success in the program and success in teaching. The criteria used to evaluate the student's success in the program were directly related to the professors' assessments of success in the program, the grade in student teaching, and the professors' predictions of success in teaching. Professor predictions of teaching success were fairly closely associated with an expected assessment of teaching performance. There was a certain overlap in the expected performance of "A" & "B", and "B" & "C" students, and there were several students for whom the predictions were completely invalid. These discrepancies appeared to result from a combination of situational and personal factors, many of which are beyond the control of the teacher education institution or the school system.

4. Based on the findings of the regression analysis, principals appeared to be assessing their teachers in a more "global" manner than professors. They also appeared to be utilizing criteria that could have been observed outside the classroom; for example, utilization of materials and media, self-confidence, etc. Many principals stated that time constraints had allowed them to actually observe the teacher in the classroom only once. Professors appeared to be using more complex criteria for evaluation, and focused on factors that have to do more with teacher-pupil interaction.

5. Until the study has been replicated on a larger sample, few conclusions can be drawn from the results of the factor analyses. However, it does appear that principals consistently tended to group together those qualities that could have been observed outside the classroom, and that professors appeared to consistently group together qualities which might have been assessed in on-campus activities (such as methods classes), rather than in the classroom setting.
6. Principals and teachers agreed on their selection of factors contributing the most to teaching success and teaching failure. However when asked in the interview to state the single most important factor in teaching success and failure, teachers mentioned "relationships with children" most often, whereas principals most frequently mentioned classroom management skills.
7. Factors such as grade and subject placement, participation in community activities, salary, extracurricular assignments, school size, etc., did not appear to be related to principals' assessments of teaching success or to teachers' assessments of their own success. However, the teachers' feelings of satisfaction with their teaching assignments did appear to be related to success.
8. Teachers in rural schools tended to be rated slightly higher than their urban counterparts. The reason for this appeared to be that most graduates preferred to teach in the urban areas; consequently urban schools are able to select their teachers from the top graduates. This statement is supported by the fact that 87% of the teachers who had received

a "C" in student teaching were employed in communities with fewer than 5,000 people. This is compared with 67% of the "B" teachers and 40% of the "A" teachers who were teaching in rural areas.

Recommendation for Further Study

The major recommendation from the findings of this study is that the researchers should proceed with a major study on a larger sample of University of Lethbridge graduates, with the main purpose and objectives being similar to those of the present study. The methodology and design of the new study should be similar except that in addition to using principals' assessments of teaching success, a major criterion of success should be an evaluation by trained observers. These observers should be trained by The University of Lethbridge Faculty of Education in the use of the evaluation instrument and methodology that is utilized by faculty supervisors. The trained observers would then observe these teachers in the classroom on a given number of occasions, thus increasing the inter-rater reliability. The use of the CIDAT[3] equipment could facilitate this procedure and make the observations more meaningful. The groundwork for this procedure was laid during the present study when each of the principals and teachers were asked during the interview if they would agree to such a procedure. All of the principals agreed readily but a few of the teachers voiced concerns depending on how the observations would be conducted.

[3]CIDAT stands for Computerized Interactive Data Acquisition Terminal which is a microminiature computer, programmed to help gather data from groups of people.

If a definite relationship can be established between evaluations in student teaching, and evaluations of teaching by trained observers, and if a collection of variables can be identified as being valid for evaluating a teacher education program and success in teaching, then principals could be trained to evaluate their teachers using these criteria.

REFERENCES

Anderson, C. C. & Hunka, S. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and A Proposal", Harvard Educational Review, 33 (1963), 74-95.

Austin, M. Evaluating The Effectiveness of University Programs for Teacher Education. Paper presented at The International Reading Association World Congress on Reading, Vienna, Austria, Aug., 1974.

Bausell, R. B. & Moody, W. B. "Are Teacher Preparation Institutions Necessary?", Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, p.298.

Beery, J. R. "Does Professional Preparation Make a Difference?", The Journal of Teacher Education, XIII, No. 4, (1962), 386-395.

Doyle, W. Paradigms in Teacher Effectiveness Research. Paper presented at The American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, April, 1975.

Ducharme, R.J. "Selected Preservice Factors Related to Success of the Beginning Teacher" cited by Turner in "An Overview of Research In Teacher Education", Teacher Education, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.

Gage, N. L. "The Yield of Research on Teaching", Phi Delta Kappan, Nov., 1978, 229-235.

Glass, G. V. Primary, Secondary and Meta-Analysis of Research. Paper presented at The American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, April, 1975.

Greaves, W. F. "Criteria for Teacher Selection Based On A Comparison of Pregraduation Performances and Teaching Success" cited by Turner in "An Overview of Research In Teacher Education", Teacher Education, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.

Guilford, J. P. & Fruchter, B. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, 5th Ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., Toronto, 1975.

Hain, J. & Smith, G. "How Principals Rate Teachers", School Board Journal, Feb., 1968, 17-18.

Hall, H. O. "Professional Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness", The Journal of Teacher Education, XV, No. 1, (1964), 72-76.

Labriola, R. J. "Comparison of Student Teaching and Initial Teaching Evaluations for Selected Teachers", Dissertation Abstracts, 27A-688.

Ort, V. K. "A Study of Some Techniques Used for Predicting the Success of Teachers", The Journal of Teacher Education, XV, No. 1, (1964), 67-71.

Pratt, D. "Predicting Teacher Survival", The Journal of Educational Research, 74, No. 1, (1977), 12-18.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers. George Banta Co., Menasha, Wisconsin, 1960.

Sandefur, J. T. & Adams, R. A. "An Evaluation of Teaching: An Interim Research Report", The Journal of Teacher Education, XXVII, No. 1, (1976), 71-76.

Turner, R. L. "An Overview of Research in Teacher Education", Teacher Education, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of The National Society for The Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.

Turner, R. L. "Are Educational Researchers Necessary?", Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, p.299.

Vittetoe, J. "Why First Year Teachers Fail", Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1977, 429-430.

APPENDIX A

The University
Of Lethbridge
4401 UNIVERSITY DRIVE
LETHBRIDGE ALBERTA
CANADA T1K 3M4
403-329-2424

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
RESEARCH CENTRE

January 9, 1978

Dear Teacher,

We are requesting your assistance in collecting data for a study which we believe will have major significance for the education of teachers in Alberta.

The study begins the third phase of a long-term project designed to evaluate The University of Lethbridge teacher education program. The project is an integral part of the Faculty's academic plan. During the first two phases of the project we have examined various selection and pre-education factors, their relationship to success within the program, and the relationships between and among various components of the program itself. This third phase is designed to determine whether the faculty evaluation of success within our teacher education program correlates with teaching success as assessed by teacher self-evaluation and principal evaluation. We also wish to examine factors which may contribute to or detract from a teacher's success or his/her perceptions of success.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to provide us with information necessary to begin Phase III. You are one of fifty University of Lethbridge graduates teaching in Alberta who have been selected at random to receive a questionnaire evaluating their teaching success.

In addition, a questionnaire and letter for your principal are also enclosed. Please give your principal his/her copy of the questionnaire and letter and return envelope. We would like you and your principal to complete your questionnaires independently and return them at your earliest convenience. Two self-addressed return envelopes are provided to maintain confidentiality.

Although the questionnaire requires some thoughtful consideration on your part we believe it can be completed within 45 minutes and we very much appreciate your cooperation.

....2

We are looking forward to a personal visit with you sometime in the next few months to obtain greater feedback on the questionnaire itself and on other aspects of the study.

You will be notified when the initial report has been completed and copies will be available for all those involved in the study. We have enclosed a keepsake for you in the form of an uncirculated silver dollar.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. V. Dravland
COORDINATOR

Mrs. M. L. Greene
ACADEMIC ASSISTANT

Encs.
MLG:HM

EVALUATION OF TEACHING SUCCESS
DIRECTIONS FOR TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

The number associated with each question (e.g. 6.1 to 6.5) are inserted only for the convenience of the keypunch operators and should not influence your responses in any way.

SECTION I

This section is designed to provide information on factors that may affect a teacher's feelings about his/her position and therefore may influence his/her success, or perceptions of success, in teaching. You are asked to indicate your first impression for all questions except those dealing with demographic information (e.g. years teaching experience, sex, etc.).

SECTION II

This particular form is being used for your evaluation of your teaching because it was used in your student teaching and we wish to determine relationships between the two. Please give very thoughtful consideration to your responses and where you are unable to make an objective judgement, please respond with "don't know".

SECTION III

We hope to determine which factors are considered by practising teachers and principals to be the most important in influencing teaching success. This section is particularly important for our long-term plans for determining the characteristics of an effective teacher. Please read the instruction carefully.

SECTION IV

This section is designed to provide information on factors such as class size, grade level, student-teacher interaction, etc. that may or may not affect a teacher's feelings of satisfaction in his/her position. Directions for completing this section are on page 5.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING SUCCESS
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many years teaching experience have you had?

   6.1 _____ this is my first year
   6.2 _____ 1 to 4 years
   6.3 _____ 5 to 9 years
   6.4 _____ 10 to 14 years
   6.5 _____ 15 or more years

2. How many years have you been teaching at this school?

   7.1 _____ this is my first year
   7.2 _____ 1 to 4 years
   7.3 _____ 5 to 9 years
   7.4 _____ 10 to 14 years
   7.5 _____ 15 or more years

3. How do you rate the physical design of your school in terms of ***teaching convenience***?

   8.1 _____ excellent
   8.2 _____ very good
   8.3 _____ good
   8.4 _____ fair
   8.5 _____ poor

4. How would you classify the social activities offered by your community? (Consider "social activities" as social, cultural, recreational, and sports events not organized by the school).

   9.1 _____ excellent
   9.2 _____ very good
   9.3 _____ good
   9.4 _____ fair
   9.5 _____ poor

5. To what extent do you participate in these community and/or social activities?

   10.1 _____ a great deal
   10.2 _____ a fair amount
   10.3 _____ a little
   10.4 _____ not at all

6. How do you rate your ***curricular assignment*** relative to that of other teachers at school?

   11.1 _____ much heavier
   11.2 _____ heavier
   11.3 _____ comparable
   11.4 _____ lighter
   11.5 _____ much lighter

7. How much time do you spend per week on ***assigned*** school-related extra-curricular activities?

   12.1 _____ less than 30 minutes
   12.2 _____ 31 to 60 minutes
   12.3 _____ 61 to 120 minutes
   12.4 _____ more than 120 minutes

8. How much time do you spend per week on ***voluntary*** school-related extra-curricular activities?

   13.1 _____ less than 30 minutes
   13.2 _____ 31 to 60 minutes
   13.3 _____ 61 to 120 minutes
   13.4 _____ more than 120 minutes

9. Do you feel that your salary provides appropriate compensation for your efforts?

   14.1 _____ underpaid
   14.2 _____ adequately paid
   14.3 _____ overpaid

10. How far do you have to travel to school?

    15.xy _____ mile(s)

11. Do you ever feel isolated from the community in which your school is located?

    17.1 _____ very often
    17.2 _____ often
    17.3 _____ sometimes
    17.4 _____ rarely
    17.5 _____ never

12. If you often or very often feel isolated what is the main reason?

    18.x _____ _____

13. Would you prefer to be teaching:

    in a different subject area?

    19.1 _____ yes (specify) _____
    19.2 _____ no

    at a different grade level?

    20.1 _____ yes (specify) _____
    20.2 _____ no

in a different geographic location?

21.1 _____ yes (specify) _____
21.2 _____ no

at a different school?

22.1 _____ yes (specify) _____
22.2 _____ no

at the same school but with different administrative philosophy?

23.1 _____ yes (specify) _____
23.2 _____ no

14. To what age group do you belong?

24.1 _____ 23 years or under
24.2 _____ 24 to 29 years
24.3 _____ 30 to 40 years
24.4 _____ 41 years or over

15. Sex:

25.1 _____ female
25.2 _____ male

SECTION II

Please rate your teaching success according to the following criteria. Put an "X" in the column that most accurately reflects your evaluation of your *present* level of success. Be as objective as possible.

		EXCELLENT	STRONG	AVERAGE	WEAK	INCOMPETENT		DON'T KNOW
		5	4	3	2	1		9
26	**Preparation**							
27	*Academic background*							
28	*Planning ability*							
29	*Suitability of lesson materials and media*							
30	*Consistency of preparation*							
31	**Performance**							
32	*Effectiveness of Methods*							
33	*Motivation of pupils*							
34	*Leading discussion*							
35	*Skill in questioning*							
36	*Handling pupils' responses*							
37	*Presenting information*							
38	*Working with individuals and small groups*							
39	*Variety in approach to presentation*							
40	*Pacing of lesson*							
41	*Creativity (originality)*							
42	*Adaptability*							
43	*Closure (culminating, summarizing, concluding activities)*							
44	*Skill in evaluating pupil learning*							
45	*Attention to individual differences*							
46	*Classroom management*							
47	*Classroom control*							
48	*Handling routines*							
49	*Giving directions*							
50	*Suitability of physical arrangement of classroom*							
51	**Personal Attributes**							
52	*Personal appearance*							
53	*Classroom manner (poise, self-control)*	46						

		5 EXCELLENT	4 STRONG	3 AVERAGE	2 WEAK	1 INCOMPETENT	9 DON'T KNOW
54	*Enthusiasm and vitality*						
55	*Empathy for pupils*						
56	*Sense of humor*						
57	*Voice quality*						
58	***English usage (grammar, spelling, colloquialisms)***						
59	*Self-concept*						
60	*Initiative*						
61	**Professional Attributes**						
62	*Dependability and punctuality*						
63	*Maturity and judgement*						
64	*Justifiable self-confidence*						
65	*Self-evaluation*						
66	*Response to criticism (receives and implements suggestions)*						
67	*Respect and admiration for pupils*						
68	*Interpersonal relations with school personnel*						
69	**Overall Assessment of Teaching Success**						

On a scale from 1 to 10 with the number 10 being assigned to the *most* effective teacher at your school and the number 1 being assigned to the *least* effective teacher at your school, what number would you assign yourself for your teaching effectiveness?

70.xy _____

Do you believe you would be more effective:

in a different subject area?

72.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
72.2 _____ no
72.3 _____ don't know

at a different grade level?

73.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
73.2 _____ no
73.3 _____ don't know

at a different school?

74.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
74.2 _____ no
74.3 _____ don't know

SECTION III

For each of the next two questions put an "X" in the box under the response that most accurately reflects your opinion.

Based on your experience how important is each of the following factors in determining *teaching success*?

		VERY IMPORTANT 5	IMPORTANT 4	UNDECIDED 3	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT 2	UNIMPORTANT 1
75.	Classroom control	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
76.	Communication skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
77.	Knowledge of subject area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
78.	Personality factors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
79.	Placement suitability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
80.	Preparation for classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	School administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	Staff interpersonal relationships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	Student characteristics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	Teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	Teaching methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Based on your experience how important is each of the following factors in determining *teaching failure*?

		VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNDECIDED	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	UNIMPORT
		5	4	3	2	1
12.	Classroom control	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	Communication skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14.	Knowledge of subject area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15.	Personality factors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.	Placement suitability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17.	Preparation for classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18.	School administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19.	Staff interpersonal relationships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20.	Student characteristics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21.	Teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22.	Teaching methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23.	Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Each of the following factors has some effect on *teaching competency*. Select the *three* that you consider to be the most important and *rank* them in order of their importance. Assign the number 1 to the factor which you consider contributes the most to teaching competency, 2 to the next most important, and 3 to the next most important.

24. _____ classroom control
25. _____ knowledge of subject area
26. _____ personality factors
27. _____ placement suitability
28. _____ preparation for classes
29. _____ school administration
30. _____ staff interpersonal relationships
31. _____ student characteristics
32. _____ teaching experience
33. _____ teaching methods
34. _____ other (specify) _____

Consider the *concept* of "teaching success". Then *rank* the following possi components according to their relative contribution to teaching success. Ass the number 1 to the item that you consider contributes the most to teach success, 2 to the next most important, and so on.

35. _____ adaptability to change
36. _____ classroom administrative efficiency
37. _____ effect on student learning
38. _____ flexibility in interpersonal relationships
39. _____ placement suitability
40. _____ teacher personality

SECTION IV

If your school operates on a "teaching cycle" other than the 5-day week, how many days are in each cycle?

41. _____ days per cycle

Please consider the following chart and then complete the information requested according to how it applies to your particular teaching schedule. The last three columns concern the type of interaction maintained between you and your classes (eg., whether purely lecture: low interaction, lecture and discussion with the class members participating: medium interaction, etc.), the level of satisfaction you feel as a result of teaching this class, and whether for some reason, you would choose either to teach or not to teach this class if you had the option.

CLASS SIZE	GRADE	SUBJECT TAUGHT	TOTAL CLASS MINUTES PER CYCLE	AVERAGE LENGTH OF EACH CLASS PERIOD	DEGREE OF TEACHER/STUDENT INTERACTION H-HIGH, M-MEDIUM, L-LOW	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION FOR THIS CLASS H-HIGH, M-MEDIUM, L-LOW	PREFERENCES FOR TEACHING THIS CLASS Y-YES, N-NO
Boys_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Boys_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Boys _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Boys _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Boys_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Boys_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Girls_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

If you wish to make further comments about any topic raised in the questionnaire, or about the questionnaire itself, please use the space below or the back of this pag
Thank you again for your cooperation.

The University
Of Lethbridge

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
RESEARCH CENTRE

January 9, 1978

Dear Principal,

We are requesting your assistance in collecting data for a study which we believe will have major significance for the education of teachers in Alberta.

The study begins the third phase of a long-term project designed to evaluate The University of Lethbridge teacher education program. This project is an integral part of the Faculty's academic plan. During the first two phases of the project we have examined various selection and pre-education factors, their relationship to success within the program, and the relationships between and among various components of the program itself. This third phase is designed to determine whether the faculty evaluation of success within our teacher education program correlates with teaching success as assessed by teacher self-evaluation and principal evaluation. We also wish to examine factors which may contribute to or detract from a teacher's success or his/her perceptions of success.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to provide us with information necessary to begin Phase III. Fifty of our graduates teaching in Alberta have been selected at random to receive a questionnaire evaluating their teaching success.

In addition each principal is being asked to evaluate the teacher's present level of teaching success. We have asked the teacher to give you your copy of the questionnaire along with this letter and a return envelope. We would like you and the teacher to complete your questionnaires independently and return them at your earliest convenience. Two self-addressed return envelopes have been provided to maintain confidentiality.

Although the questionnaire requires some thoughtful consideration on your part we believe it can be completed within 45 minutes and we very much appreciate your cooperation.

....2

We are looking forward to a personal visit with you sometime in the next few months to obtain greater feedback on the questionnaire itself and on other aspects of the study.

You will be notified when the initial report has been completed and copies will be available for all those involved in the study. We have enclosed a keepsake for you in the form of an uncirculated silver dollar.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. V. Dravland
COORDINATOR

Mrs. M. L. Greene
ACADEMIC ASSISTANT

Encs.
MLG:HM

EVALUATION OF TEACHING SUCCESS
DIRECTIONS FOR PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The number associated with each question (e.g. 6.1 to 6.5) are inserted only for the convenience of keypunch operators and should no influence your responses in any way.

SECTION I

This section is designed to provide information on factors that may affect a teacher's feelings about his/her position and therefore may influence his/her success, or perceptions of success, in teaching. You are asked to indicate your first impression for all questions except those dealing with demographic information (e.g. years experience as principal, sex, etc.). However, if there are questions about the teacher for which you find it difficult to decide the appropriate response, please do not guess.

SECTION II

This particular form is being used for your evaluation of the teacher because it was used to evaluate his/her student teaching and we wish t determine relationships between the two. Please give very thoughtful consideration to your responses and where you are unable to make an objective judgement, please respond with "don't know".

SECTION III

We hope to determine which factors are considered by practising teachers and principals to be the most important in influencing teaching success. This section is particularly important for our long-term plans for determining the characteristics of an effective teacher. Please read the instructions carefully.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING SUCCESS
PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I

1. How many years total experience have you had as a principal, vice-principal, or assistant principal?

   6.1 _____ this is my first year
   6.2 _____ 1 to 4 years
   6.3 _____ 5 to 9 years
   6.4 _____ 10 to 14 years
   6.5 _____ 15 or more years

2. For how many years have you been principal, vice-principal, or assistant principal for this teacher?

   7.1 _____ this is my first year
   7.2 _____ 2 to 4 years
   7.3 _____ 5 to 9 years
   7.4 _____ 10 to 14 years
   7.5 _____ 15 or more years

3. What type of school system are you in?

   8.1 _____ public
   8.2 _____ separate
   8.3 _____ independent
   8.4 _____ other (specify) _____

4. What grade levels are taught in your school? Check all appropriate categories.

   9.1 _____ kindergarten
   10.1 _____ primary (1-3)
   11.1 _____ upper elementary (4-6)
   12.1 _____ junior high (7-9)
   13.1 _____ senior high (10-12)

5. What is your current school population?

   14.wxyz _____ students

6. How do you rate the physical design of your school in terms of ***teaching convenience***?

   18.1 _____ excellent
   18.2 _____ very good
   18.3 _____ good
   18.4 _____ fair
   18.5 _____ poor

7. What type of population does your school predominantly serve?

   19.1 _____ rural
   19.2 _____ small community
   19.3 _____ suburban (to Calgary or Edmonton)
   19.4 _____ urban

8. What is the approximate size of the community in which your school i located?

   20.1 _____ less than 500 people
   20.2 _____ 501 to 1,000 people
   20.3 _____ 1,001 to 5,000 people
   20.4 _____ 5,001 to 10,000 people
   20.5 _____ 10,001 to 20,000 people
   20.6 _____ 20,001 to 30,000 people
   20.7 _____ 30,001 to 40,000 people
   20.8 _____ 40,001 to 50,000 people
   20.9 _____ more than 50,000 people

9. How would you classify the social activities offered by the community i which your school is located? (Consider "social activities" as socia cultural, recreational and sports events not organized by the school.)

   21.1 _____ excellent
   21.2 _____ very good
   21.3 _____ good
   21.4 _____ fair
   21.5 _____ poor

10. To what extent does this teacher participate in community and/or socia activities?

    22.1 _____ a great deal
    22.2 _____ a fair amount
    22.3 _____ a little
    22.4 _____ not at all
    22.5 _____ don't know

11. How do you rate this teacher's ***curricular assignment*** relative to that of othe teachers at your school?

    23.1 _____ much heavier
    23.2 _____ heavier
    23.3 _____ comparable
    23.4 _____ lighter
    23.5 _____ much lighter

12. How much time does this teacher spend per week on ***assigned*** school related extracurricular activities?

    24.1 _____ less than 30 minutes
    24.2 _____ 31-60 minutes
    24.3 _____ 61-120 minutes
    24.4 _____ more than 120 minutes
    24.5 _____ don't know

13. How much time does this teacher spend per week on ***voluntary*** school-related extracurricular activities?

25.1 _____ less than 30 minutes
25.2 _____ 31-60 minutes
25.3 _____ 61-120 minutes
25.4 _____ more than 120 minutes
25.5 _____ don't know

14. How many teachers are employed in your school? Insert the correct number for each category.

26.xy _____ full-time female
28.xy _____ full-time male
30.xy _____ part-time female
32.xy _____ part-time male

15. How many administrators are employed in your school? (Consider the following as administrators: principals, assistant principals, vice-principals, and department heads.) Insert the number for each category.

34.xy _____ full-time female
36.xy _____ full-time male
38.xy _____ part-time female
40.xy _____ part-time male

16. How many teacher aides are employed by your school? Insert the numbe for each category.

42.xy _____ full-time female
44.xy _____ full-time male
46.xy _____ part-time female
48.xy _____ part-time male

17. Is anyone in your school specifically assigned to assist newly graduate teachers?

50.1 _____ yes (specify position) _____
50.2 _____ no

18. To what age group do you belong?

51.1 _____ 23 years or under
51.2 _____ 24 to 29 years
51.3 _____ 30 to 40 years
51.4 _____ 41 years or over

19. Sex:

52.1 _____ female
52.2 _____ male

SECTION II

Please rate this teacher's teaching success according to the following criteria. Put an "X" in the column that most accurately reflects your evaluation of his/her *present* level of success. Be as objective as possible.

		EXCELLENT	STRONG	AVERAGE	WEAK	INCOMPETENT		DON'T KNOW
		5	4	3	2	1		9
53.	**Preparation**							
54.	*Academic background*							
55.	*Planning ability*							
56.	*Suitability of lesson materials and media*							
57.	*Consistency of preparation*							
58.	**Performance**							
59.	*Effectiveness of Methods*							
60.	*Motivation of pupils*							
61.	*Leading discussion*							
62.	*Skill in questioning*							
63.	*Handling pupils' responses*							
64.	*Presenting information*							
65.	*Working with individuals and small groups*							
66.	*Variety in approach to presentation*							
67.	*Pacing of lesson*							
68.	*Creativity (originality)*							
69.	*Adaptability*							
70.	*Closure (culminating, summarizing, concluding activities)*							
71.	*Skill in evaluating pupil learning*							
72.	*Attention to individual differences*							
73.	*Classroom management*							
74.	*Classroom control*							
75.	*Handling routines*							

		EXCELLENT 5	STRONG 4	AVERAGE 3	WEAK 2	INCOMPETENT 1		DON'T KNOW 9
76.	*Giving directions*							
77.	*Suitability of physical arrangement of classroom*							
78.	**Personal Attributes**							
79.	*Personal appearance*							
80.	*Classroom manner (poise, self-control)*							
6.	*Enthusiasm and vitality*							
7.	*Empathy for pupils*							
8.	*Sense of humor*							
9.	*Voice quality*							
10.	*English usage (grammar, spelling, colloquialisms)*							
11.	*Self-concept*							
12.	*Initiative*							
13.	**Professional Attributes**							
14.	*Dependability and punctuality*							
15.	*Maturity and judgement*							
16.	*Justifiable self-confidence*							
17.	*Self-evaluation*							
18.	*Response to criticism (receives and implements suggestions)*							
19.	*Respect and admiration for pupils*							
20.	*Interpersonal relations with school personnel*							
21.	**Overall Assessment of Teaching Success**							

On a scale from 1 to 10 with the number 10 being assigned to the ***most*** effective teacher at your school and the number 1 being assigned to the ***least*** effective teacher at your school, what number would you assign to this teacher for his/her teaching effectiveness?

22.xy _____

Do you believe this teacher would be more effective: in a different subject area?

24.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
24.2 _____ no
24.3 _____ don't know

at a different grade level?

25.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
25.2 _____ no
25.3 _____ don't know

at a different school?

26.1 _____ yes (Comment) _____
26.2 _____ no
26.3 _____ don't know

SECTION III

For each of the next two questions put an "X" in the box under the response that most accurately reflects your opinion.

Based on your experience how important is each of the following factors in determining ***teaching success***?	VERY IMPORTANT 5	IMPORTANT 4	UNDECIDED 3	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT 2	UNIMPORTANT 1
27 Classroom control	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28 Communication skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29 Knowledge of subject area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30 Personality factors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31 Placement suitability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32 Preparation for classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33 School administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34 Staff interpersonal relationships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35 Student characteristics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36 Teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37 Teaching methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38 Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Based on your experience how important is each of the following factors in determining ***teaching failure***?	VERY IMPORTANT 5	IMPORTANT 4	UNDECIDED 3	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT 2	UNIMPORTANT 1
39 Classroom control	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40 Communication skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41 Knowledge of subject area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42 Personality factors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43 Placement suitability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44 Preparation for classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45 School administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46 Staff interpersonal relationships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47 Student characteristics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48 Teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49 Teaching methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50 Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Each of the following factors has some effect on ***teaching competency***. Select the ***three*** that you consider to be the most important and ***rank*** them in order of their importance. Assign the number 1 to the factor which you consider contributes the most to teaching competency, 2 to the next most important, and 3 to the next most important.

51 _____ classroom control
52 _____ knowledge of subject area
53 _____ personality factors
54 _____ placement suitability
55 _____ preparation for classes
56 _____ school administration
57 _____ staff interpersonal relationships
58 _____ student characteristics
59 _____ teaching experience
60 _____ teaching methods
61 _____ other (specify) _____

Consider the ***concept*** of "teaching success". Then ***rank*** the following possible components according to their relative contribution to teaching success. Assign the number 1 to the item that you consider contributes the most to teaching success, 2 to the next most important, and so on.

62 _____ adaptability to change
63 _____ classroom administrative efficiency
64 _____ effect on student learning
65 _____ flexibility in interpersonal relationships
66 _____ placement suitability
67 _____ teacher personality

If you wish to make further comments about any topic raised in this questionnaire, or about the questionnaire itself, please use the space at the bottom of page 3, or insert an extra page. Thank you again for your cooperation.